

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8                   UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9                   WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
10                  AT SEATTLE

11                  STUDIO 010 INC,

CASE NO. 2:20-cv-01018-DGE

12                  Plaintiff,

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR  
CORRECTION AND  
CONSOLIDATED JUDGMENT  
(DKT. NO. 132)

v.

13                  DIGITAL CASHFLOW LLC et al.,

14                  Defendants.

15  
16                  Presently before the Court is Plaintiff's motion "for correction of the Final Report On  
17 The Filing Or Determination Of An Action Regarding A Patent Or Trademark" and "for  
18 consolidation of the orders in Dkt Nos. 116, 117, 124, and 127, into a single recordable judgment  
19 for entry and enforcement." (Dkt. No. 132.)

20                  Plaintiff asks the Court to modify form AO 120, which was filed with the Director of the  
21 U.S. Patent and Trademark Office by the Clerk's office on May 31, 2024. (Dkt. No. 128.) The  
22 form provides a report "on the filing or determination of an action regarding a patent or  
23 trademark." (*Id.*) The form advised the Patent Office of the Court's order of October 13, 2023,  
24

1 in which the Court granted in part and denied in part Plaintiff's motion for default judgment.  
2 (*Id.*) In the form, the Clerk's office summarized the judgment issued on October 13, 2023,  
3 which focused largely on the monetary damages awarded by the Court. (*See* Dkt. Nos. 117;  
4 128.) Plaintiff contends the AO 120 form does not mention the Court's ruling with respect to  
5 invalidity of the '191 patent and asks the Court to amend the form to highlight the Court's  
6 finding. (Dkt. No. 132 at 1.) However, Plaintiff cites no authority for the proposition that the  
7 Court can or should modify the AO 120 form in the manner Plaintiff suggests. To the extent  
8 Plaintiff wishes to draw the Patent Office's attention to the Court's finding with respect to  
9 invalidity, he may submit a copy of the Court's order.

10 Plaintiff further seeks to consolidate several of the Court's rulings into a single document  
11 "to streamline the process of enforcing the judgment in one or more state or Federal courts." (*Id.*  
12 at 2.) The proposed judgment submitted by Plaintiff summarizes the findings of the Court in its  
13 orders on Plaintiff's motion for default judgment, Plaintiff's motion for attorney fees, and the  
14 Clerk's order on Plaintiff's bill of costs. (Dkt. No. 132-2.) Plaintiff has not provided any  
15 authority for the proposition that the Court can or should issue the type of "consolidated"  
16 judgment Plaintiff seeks—and as of now, has not provided any evidence why the already issued  
17 orders and judgment are not enforceable. To the extent Plaintiff wishes to provide a summary of  
18 the Court's findings to ease enforcement, he may do so in the form of a cover letter accurately  
19 describing the Court's findings. Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion (Dkt. No. 132) is DENIED.

20 Dated this 22nd day of August, 2024.

21   
22  
23

David G. Estudillo  
United States District Judge